

ONE PLACE WHERE THE OLD-FASHION LONG HAT PINS WOULD COME IN HANDY

BY JANE WHITAKER

The case of Mrs. Joseph M. Kraus, who had her employer, Edward B. Grossman, head of the firm of F. N. Matthews, women's outfitters, arrested, charged with having forcibly kissed her, should teach a lesson to any woman who contemplates exposing an employer for the same reason.

Mrs. Kraus declared she took this step in the hope of saving other girls from the same disagreeable experience and that she intended to have Mr. Grossman punished, but, in the slang of the day, "It can't be done."

Not so long ago I had occasion to go to a business office, and when I entered I thought the place deserted. However, I detected a solid mass of black leaning up against the window, so I coughed discreetly. The solid mass disentangled itself and separated into five men, each wearing a sheepish grin.

I looked beyond them through the window and, in the office across the areaway, I saw a man of about forty-five holding and kissing a girl who was trying to get away from him.

The men tittered, but I did not. I have heard so many girls tell of indignities endured that they might hold positions, or positions sacrificed because they would not endure indignities, that I felt furiously angry.

"That's the third girl in a month that duffer's had," the bookkeeper explained.

"She ought to have him arrested," I cried, and at that time I believed it, but—

Mrs. Kraus tells a very plausible story. She claims that Grossman showed from the first day she entered the employ of the firm that he was attracted by her, and, a week later, he caught her on the stairway, held her against her struggles, and kissed and squeezed her.

The case came up in the New Mor-

als Court, a court intended to handle and punish such cases, but Grossman, through his counsel, obtained a continuance.

After this there followed quite a few more continuances and Grossman objected to almost every judge until he and his attorney finally agreed to let Judge Torrison try the case.

Mrs. Kraus, perhaps becoming a little fearful when she discovered how a man with money and a lawyer can juggle things of this sort, hired a lawyer in her own defense, to act as assistant counsel to Assistant City Prosecuting Attorney Schwartz.

This lawyer, Mark Sullivan, claims that Schwartz refused to let him act as assistant counsel on behalf of Mrs. Kraus, and Schwartz has allowed evidence to be admitted that has tended very materially to defame the character of Mrs. Kraus.

The odd part of the whole thing is that it would seem as though Mrs. Kraus were the defendant. Witnesses with marvelous memories for faces have been produced who, having seen Mrs. Kraus once, can swear, under oath, that they recognize her and remember that on the very afternoon she testified Grossman insulted her she was intoxicated. Even a street car conductor can remember this.

Women are testifying that Mrs. Kraus told them she had been drinking, which is such a very likely tale.

Grossman, himself, if he is innocent, seems to have no idea of the seriousness of the charge made against him, nor how contemptible he is, if he is guilty. His replies are absolutely flippant.

Asked if he had pinched Mrs. Kraus, he replied:

"Not a pinch, no."

Asked if he had squeezed her, he answered:

"Never a squeeze, no."

The case will probably be decided